



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/556,342

12/19/2006

Soungbong Choi

9988.260.00

8596

30827

7590

05/07/2009

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

KO, JASON Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/07/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/556,342	Applicant(s) CHOI, SOUNGBONG	
	Examiner JASON Y. KO	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 November 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20090408, 20060623</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, Claims 1-8 in the reply filed on 10 March, 2009 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 9-15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10 March 2009.
3. Examiner notes that Claim 16 was inadvertently grouped in Group II. Claim 16 has been rejoined and will be examined with Group I.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:
5. Claim 1 recites "operation" in lines 3 and 4. These should read "operations" instead.
6. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1792

8. Claims 4-5, 7-8, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Regarding Claims 8 and 16, it is unclear if the information on washing includes one kind of information of the three listed (and intended to be in a Markush claim format. See MPEP §2173.05) or if the information on washing includes one of each. For examination purposes this limitation will be treated as a Markush claim.

10. Regarding Claims 4-5, it is unclear whether in the language "transmit/receive" and "thereto/therefrom," the backslash is intended to be an "and" or an "or."

11. Regarding Claim 7, it is unclear what it is meant by "laundry proper to various identification codes" and "identification code proper to the laundry." It is assumed for examination purposes, "proper" means "assigned with" or "assigned to."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

13. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by GUZZI et al. (USPA 2001/0049846).

14. Regarding Claim 1, GUZZI et al. teaches a washing system comprising: an information tag fastened to laundry (RFID tag, [0036]), having information on the

Art Unit: 1792

laundry stored therein (identifies clothing or information relating to item of clothing, [0036]); a laundry device (washing machine 22, [0035]) for progressing various washing related operations (washing machine inherently accomplishes washing related operations), the laundry device having a control unit (user interface 28 has a computer system comprising a CPU, [0034], which is a control unit); a reader (ID device 40, [0036]) for receiving a signal from the information tag on the laundry, to obtain information stored in the information tag (the identification device 40 may recognize the clothing via the RFID tag, [0036]); and a home server (director 25, Fig. 2 and [0036]) connected (operatively, Fig. 2 and [0036]) to the control unit of the laundry device to be able to supply various control signals and receive information obtained by the reader (the identification device 40 might transmit the identification to a director 25, [0036]).

15. Regarding Claims 2-3, GUZZI et al. teaches that the reader can be integrated into the washing machine or separate from the washing machine. See [0035]. More specifically, GUZZI et al. teaches the system 20 comprising an identification device 40 ([0032]) to be integrated or separate from the washing machine.

16. Regarding Claim 5, GUZZI et al. teaches the reader (ID device 40, Fig. 2) to be connected (indirectly through director 25, Fig. 2) to the home server (director 25, Fig. 2). These components are operatively connected and would be expected to carry out the functional limitation of transmitting or receiving information from each other.

17. Regarding Claim 6, GUZZI et al. teaches the home server (director 25 including data store 34, Fig. 2) to have information on washing laundry (including executable instructions for determining the amount and type of laundry compositions in the

Art Unit: 1792

detergent dispenser, See [0041]-[0042]), and the information tag on the laundry has information stored therein (information related to the clothing may be directly stored on the tag, [0036]).

18. Regarding Claim 7, GUZZI et al. teaches the home server (director) to have information on washing laundry having identification codes (ID tag 56 transmits a serial number to the ID device, which then passes the number to the director, [0073] and thus the director has the information) and teaches the information tag on the laundry to have an identification code (serial number, [0073]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

20. Claims 4, 8, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over GUZZI et al. (USPA 2001/0049846).

21. GUZZI et al. is relied upon as described above in the rejection of Claim 1.

22. Regarding Claim 4, GUZZI et al. teaches the reader (ID device 40, Fig. 2) to be connected (indirectly through director 25, Fig. 2) to the control unit (user interface 28 which includes a CPU, Fig. 2). GUZZI et al. fails to explicitly teach that the reader and

Art Unit: 1792

control units would be able to transmit and receive data from each other. However, it would be obvious that these components would transmit data because they are indirectly connected to each other via the director (25, Fig. 2) and both components transfer data to the director.

23. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the washing system as taught by GUZZI et al. and have the reader and control unit operatively connected to be able to transmit data from each other, because it is well known, expected, and obvious in view of the control module structure and for performing the intended purpose of this structure.

24. Claim 8 is directed to washing information including at least one of: preferable operation time period for respective cycles, preferable operation temperatures for respective cycles, or preferable water levels for respective cycles for the laundry, which GUZZI et al. fails to teach explicitly. However, GUZZI et al. teaches the determination of optimized operating conditions via the director and optimization module. See [0061] and [0073].

25. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the washing system as taught by GUZZI et al. and include information on preferable operating conditions because GUZZI et al. teaches the determination of optimized operating conditions for improved cleaning.

26. Claim 16 rejected as being unpatentable over GUZZI et al. under an analogous rejection to Claim 8, with the exception that Claim 16 depends on Claim 7 instead of Claim 6.

Conclusion

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON Y. KO whose telephone number is 571-270-7451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; 9:30am-7:00pm.

28. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL BARR can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

29. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JYK/
Jason Y. Ko
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792
5 May 2009

/Michael Barr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1792

Application/Control Number: 10/556,342
Art Unit: 1792

Page 8